

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts

ANNUAL REPORT

OF THE

COMMISSION ON PROBATION

FOR THE

YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 1923.



BOSTON

PUBLICATION OF THIS DOCUMENT APPROVED BY THE SUPERVISOR OF ADMINISTRATION

C K

COMMISSION ON PROBATION

CHARLES M. DAVENPORT, *Chairman*

JOHN PERRINS

THOMAS H. DOWD

ALLISON G. CATHERON

MISS MARY E. DRISCOLL

HERBERT C. PARSONS, *Deputy Commissioner and Secretary*

Office, 174 Court House, Pemberton Square, Boston.

CONTENTS

REPORTS		PAGE
Report of the Commission		3
Report of the Deputy Commissioner		4
Continued Increase		4
Financial Growth		5
Out-of-Court Service		5
Investigations		6
Needs of the Service		6
Value of Women Officers		6
Extensions Rest with the Courts		7
Proportion of Probation and Other Dispositions		7
Offenses in Probation Cases		7
Discrimination in Use of Probation		8
Tested by Results		8
Purposes of Collections		8
Cost of the Service		8
Bureau of Records		8
Conferences of Probation Officers		
Conference at American House		
Conference at Greenfield		9
Conference at Worcester		9
Conference of Superior Court Officers		10
Conference at Girls' Industrial School		10
Changes in the Service		10
Bureau of Information		10
STATISTICAL TABLE		
Cases Placed on Probation:		
Table 1.—Superior Courts		12
Table 2.—Municipal, Juvenile and District Courts		13
Table 2.—Summary of All Courts		15
Results of Probation:		
Table 3.—Superior Courts		16
Table 4.—Municipal, Juvenile and District Courts		16
Table 5.—Summary of All Courts		18
Probation by Offences:		
Table 6		18
Probation Population:		
Table 7		20
Comparative Dispositions:		
Table 8		22
Releases by Probation Officers:		
Table 9		25
Collections by Probation Officers:		
Table 10		27

C73r
1923
B

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON PROBATION

To the Honorable the Senate and the House of Representatives in General Court assembled.

The Commission on Probation respectfully submits this fifteenth report, covering the work subject to its supervision for the year ending September 30, 1923. A detailed review of this work by the Deputy Commissioner of Probation presented herewith deserves careful reading and for that reason no attempt is made to summarize it.

The Commission believes that the experience of this Commonwealth has demonstrated beyond question the necessity, in a correctional system, of the performance by some one of the duties imposed by our statutes upon probation officers, and that it is now worth while to consider the natural development of the principle involved in these statutes.

The principle underlying this legislation is that society is best protected in dealing with an offender by discovering, if possible, how much and what sort of social danger his character presents and attempting by appropriate means to avoid that danger in the future. The earlier principle or theory was, that consideration of the offender's character was unimportant, since he could best be kept from the repetition of offences, and others could be best warned from his course, by the infliction upon him of a penalty proportioned to his crime. It has been necessary to abandon this earlier theory since experience has shown that many men who commit crimes are so different from the assumed normal man that the infliction of the penalty of imprisonment has little bearing upon their future conduct. The presence in the criminal population of numerous recidivists who have served repeated prison sentences is evidence of the statement last made.

Massachusetts made an early application of the discovery that the source of crime is the character of the criminal, by creating the reformatory as distinguished from the prison. It has recently made another in providing for psychiatric examination of prisoners in jails and houses of correction.

The imposition upon the probation officer of the duty of investigation of the previous social history, circumstances, etc., and criminal record of offenders is another application of this discovery. An offender's history and criminal record are presented to the court that it may judge more accurately of his character than it could from knowledge of the crime alone. In applying this more recent principle the court is confronted with a much more serious problem than any arising under the older principle. The determination of the conditions under which an offender may safely be allowed his liberty and the determination that his character is such a danger to the community that he should be segregated from the community, are matters of great difficulty, so great that the court should have the aid of as highly specialized training as is practicable. Probation officers have need of training, similar in many respects to that required of teachers, vocational advisers, and social workers, whose duties make upon them very similar demands.

Even with the best training practicable for probation officers, the court for best results will need the assistance of psychiatrists having special knowledge of the abnormal physical and mental conditions so often met with among criminals.

The work of the probation officer in assisting those placed on probation to make such permanent adjustment with their surroundings as to keep out of trouble, will be made more uniformly successful by the more discriminating selection of persons who may safely be placed on probation, by the better understanding of such persons acquired in more thorough investigation preceding probation, and by the recognition that changes in character, and the adjustment of conditions to avoid unusual strain on those of weak character,

cannot be effected without much more frequent contact and intimate relationship between the probation officer and the probationer than is possible with the large number often at present placed under the supervision of a single probation officer. It will, perhaps, sometime be recognized that there are many now coming before the courts who are not bad, but merely weak, or inferior in such respects that only by much longer probation terms than now employed or by practically permanent guardianship can they live in communities and observe the standards that civilized life requires.

In many courts there is an adequate appreciation of the ideals of probation service here set forth, and in some few courts facilities exist for substantial realization of these ideals in many cases. A general attainment of such a standard may be expected to take place gradually, and only as each extension justifies itself by the social and economic results. The Commission believes, however, that the ideals presented are practicable and such as the probation service of this Commonwealth should seek to attain.

Respectfully submitted

CHARLES M. DAVENPORT, *Chairman.*

JOHN PERRINS

THOMAS H. DOWD

ALLISON G. CATHERON

MARY ELIZABETH DRISCOLL

Commission on Probation.

REPORT OF THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER

To the Honorable Commission on Probation.

GENTLEMEN:—I have the honor to submit my report as Deputy Commissioner for the year ending September 30, 1923, the fifteenth year since the Commission was established.

Continued Increase

The volume of business devolving upon the probation service during the year was the largest in its history. The number of cases placed on probation, 29,767, was the largest in any year except 1917, when it was 30,588. As compared with that year other features of the service quite over-balance the slight difference in the number of new cases, in ways that will be shown in further comment to follow. The number placed on probation in 1923 was 1600 larger than the preceding year (1922), 6,000 larger than in 1921, and 11,500 larger than in 1920. The number in each year within the period of Commission reports is as follows:

1909	13,967	1917	30,588
1910	15,518	1918	24,017
1911	15,887	1919	24,537
1912	17,538	1920	18,209
1913	21,074	1921	23,845
1914	24,714	1922	28,177
1915	27,994	1923	29,767
1916	28,953							

The business carried on by the service is to be gauged more accurately by the average number of cases during a given period. Thus, at the end of 1917, the number of active cases was 16,222, while at the end of 1923 it was 17,838, the largest of record. The tendency towards longer average terms of probation in the municipal and district courts accounts for the marked increase in "population." That tendency has the important significance that the courts are increasingly regarding probation as a constructive undertaking, requiring a longer period of time in individual cases. While in the bulk it increases the load of the system, it makes possible a fuller accomplishment of the correctional design.

Financial Growth

Another measure is in the fiscal feature. The collections of money from persons on probation and disbursement to their families or other designated beneficiaries have, during this year, far exceeded any previous record. The officers collected during the year \$1,440,483. This sum is larger than in 1922 by \$218,109.26. It has more than doubled in the past five years. There are many courts in the State that collect singly more than the total for the whole State the first year of the commission's existence (1909).

The financial operations constitute a serious task for the officers, the receipts and payments alike being in small weekly amounts. They involve more than the handling of this increasing sum of money as each case presents its social or domestic problem. It is no longer regarded as a full discharge of the responsibility of the officers to collect and pay out under orders of the court. The ideal constantly presented is to make the relationship to the family, in non-support cases, count for the betterment of conditions in the family and a prudent use of the income to the substantial advantage of wife and children, while the possible reconciliation and unenforced support are ends that the officers are constantly to keep in mind.

That such case work is attained to the extent it is must be placed to the very considerable credit of the officers, but the number of officers and the time they can devote to these constructive tasks are quite too limited to make possible an approach to complete realization of the full social benefits.

Out-of-Court Service

Aside from these obvious increases in the public service expected of the probation officers and discharged by them with a high degree of efficiency there are two which are not reflected in their statistical reports. One is the informal adjustment of complaints. Cases numbering into the thousands are dealt with by them without court records. Domestic troubles are brought to them and adjustment secured. Juvenile offences are referred to them by the court and the police with the result that the complainants are satisfied and the child amply corrected. Offenders of a more serious nature are in some instances dealt with by the officers under the court's approval without arraignment. And there is the passing upon the question of release of persons arrested for drunkenness, of whom 36,422 were released during this year without court appearance, constituting 44 per cent of the total arrests.

Investigations

The other unmeasured increase of the probation officer's service is the growing dependence of the courts upon their investigation of cases prior to disposition. This reliance is complete as to previous criminal records. The result is that every probation office has come to carry a file of cumulative personal records from which this information can be given to the court. Within the district covered by the bureau of information in the office of the Commission this service extends to daily inquiries by the probation officers in order to secure past records of offenders in other courts than the one where he has again appeared.

But information sought by the courts does not end with a showing of criminal record, or its absence. It includes all the information securable as to the offender. This field of investigation is not new to the probation officer; it is as old as the service itself and was one of the chief ends sought in the creation of this office. What is new, relatively speaking, is the unwillingness of the courts to fix penalties or otherwise dispose of a case until full information is presented. The swing of the probation officers' work to the field of investigation has been strongly marked in recent years and in the well conducted office it has brought about a system of inquiry which meets the court's demands. The problem it creates is to discharge this important duty without lessening the attention given to that other primary duty of a competent and effective supervision of the cases placed on probation.

Needs of the Service

Such review of the probation system's activities and responsibilities leads to two observations. One is that the service calls for a constantly increasing skill and efficiency in the officers. These qualities are supplied in the courts where the officers have been long in the service to an extent that gives ground for high claim for their merit. New appointments of officers demand consideration of a personal fitness and training, which if they were ever a matter of indifference cannot safely be disregarded when so much is demanded. The other is that the number of officers has not increased in keeping with the needs of the service.

The number of probation officers in the courts of the State when the Commission was established was 101. It is now 160. That this growth has not kept pace with the demands upon the service is apparent. In a measure the officers have been relieved of office duties by the addition of clerks, of whom there are now 40 in the State, and this development has been a great addition to thoroughness of the work and has brought about in many instances the release of the officers for the performance of their important duties. But many officers are still occupied with office duties to an extent that deprives the court of full value in investigation and reduces supervision to a perfunctory reliance upon the reporting of the probationer in place of a thorough-going oversight and constructive handling.

In smaller district courts a single officer meets the needs of the situation in most cases. In the somewhat larger ones, it is a fair question for the judge to consider if some clerical assistance, not necessarily full time, would not give the officer greater value in his service. In the larger courts the work fails of full effectiveness by reason of an inadequate force. None of these can be said to be over-manned. But the building up of a service that would meet what the public's interest demands has been unequal. There are courts with populous jurisdiction in which a single officer is still relied upon to do the whole task, including the routine recording and accounting, making impossible any such dealing with the problems a great number of persons in his care present as is reasonably demanded.

Value of Women Officers

The addition of women officers in certain of the courts has proved a great reinforcement of their probation work. It remains however to be fully realized that women and girl offenders require a woman's care. But that is not the whole case for the employment of women as probation officers. They bring great contribution to the service in the dealing with domestic relations cases, making themselves indispensable in any court that appreciates the opportunity these cases present for more than a bare compliance with an order for support. They also prove to be of great worth in supervision of the younger boys, thus supplying what is otherwise lacking, a competent discharge of the court's responsibility as to juvenile delinquency. Some of the most populous jurisdictions in large industrial cities and even in the city of Boston, are still without a woman officer, a presence which the judges of smaller courts have found to be indispensable.

Extensions Rests With the Courts

Under our law as it now is, every court is empowered to appoint such probation officers as it finds necessary. The exercise of this power has fortunately been cautious. The judges are safe guardians of public expenditure. There is no peril of excesses in their administration. The great saving to the public in the dealing with offenders by probation, which has been too often presented to need new argument, warrants a reasonable liberality in the equipment of the service with a sufficient number of officers, such compensation as will secure competent ones, and their release from routine office duties by the provision of clerical assistance. That uniformity has yet to be reached.

Proportion of Probation and other Dispositions

The year's records show an undiminished use of probation by the Massachusetts courts. It varies slightly from year to year. The number of cases so dealt with is larger this year than before, but it keeps a singularly uniform relation to the number of persons convicted of offenses. For several years it has kept near to 25 per cent of all convictions. In 1916 it was 26.2 per cent; in 1917, 25.2 per cent; in 1918, 25.7 per cent; in 1919, 25.4 per cent; in 1920, 23.2 per cent; in 1921, 24.7 per cent; in 1922, 26.9 per cent. In the year just closed it was 26.2 per cent.

This means that out of 1,000 persons convicted of all offences, 262 were placed on probation. The number out of 1,000 who upon conviction were sentenced to institutions was 79, as against 67 in 1922. The other dispositions have been: Fined, 354; placed on file 305. The 262 placed on probation included those whose sentence to imprisonment or to pay fines was suspended.

Offences in Probation Cases

The offences of which the persons placed on probation were convicted cover nearly the whole range of the criminal code. It is not unknown for a person convicted of murder to be placed on probation, but such a case has not occurred in several years. In this year's list are two cases of manslaughter, 26 of assault with a dangerous weapon, 3 of assault with intent to kill, 57 of assault on an officer, but the sum of such offences, conviction of which resulted in probation, is small in a total of over 29,000 placed on probation. There seems to be no tendency towards the use of probation in extreme crimes. Indeed in a comparison with 1917, selecting the offences that by name suggest serious criminality, the total for this year is 401 as against 423, six years before. Sex offences are a considerable group, numbering 1,490, including 326 illegitimate child cases, which properly belong in the non-support class, the use of probation being with a view to securing support of the child.

The bulk of probation cases is made up of misdemeanants. Of these, 12,326 were for drunkenness, about 40 per cent of the total, relatively much smaller than in the early years of probation when it was mainly used for inebriates. Recent years have brought two numerous groups to the probation list, the motor-vehicle violators and the liquor law offenders. There were this year 2,046 of the former, as against 519 in 1917.

Liquor law offenders are placed on probation, as a rule, with a suspended sentence to imprisonment, the effect of which in case of another violation within a considerable period of time is to cause a revocation and commitment, from which there can be no appeal. The number of liquor law violators on probation this year was 2,046, as against only 3 in 1917.

Next to the drunkenness cases the most numerous group is those convicted of larceny, 3,119. Other offences contributing largely to the probation list are: non-support, 1,887; breaking and entering, 1,232; assault and battery, 1,140; disturbing the peace, 371; unlawful appropriation, 264; violation of city ordinances, 298; gaming, 234; stubbornness, 317. The name of the offence has long since ceased to be regarded as indicative of its seriousness. For example, the presence of 30 cases of forgery in the probation list is accounted for by relatively insignificant offences, measured by the amount, as in the case of a boy endorsing a check for \$2.50 which came into his possession by chance. That there were five burglars put on probation this year loses its seriousness when it is known that four of the five were boys.

Discrimination in Use of Probation

The discrimination with which probation is used by the courts is known to those familiar with the exacting care with which they inform themselves as to the accused person and the circumstances of both the offence and the offender. That it is employed with complete accuracy and uniformity is not to be claimed any more than that penalties are inflicted with unvarying discretion. On the other hand, the larger number of cases "placed on file" raises a question of equal pertinence as to whether there is not in this list a considerable element in which

the supervision of a probation officer might not be exercised to advantage. All such questions reach their answer, not in percentages or in any bulk observations, but in the individual case which confronts the judge and demands his choice of instruments for correction which the law provides.

Tested by Results

The obvious test of probation is in the results, as shown in the final action of the courts in termination of the case. Year by year, the proportion of those who are discharged by the court after the probation period goes higher. Out of 23,440 cases terminated this year 19,552 were discharged or "placed on file," the two terms meaning the same release from restraint. These constitute 83.4 per cent. There were 1,264 who disappeared, 5.4 per cent. There were surrendered by the probation officers 2,279, and probation was ended by new arrests in 345 cases, the two amounting to 11.2 per cent. Thus the failures amounted to 16.6 per cent.

Under a special resolve of the legislature, a survey was in progress at the close of the year as to the more permanent results, to be tested by the study of the subsequent careers of persons who had been on probation at a period long enough in the past to give a basis for conclusions as to whether they reverted to offending. The findings will be the subject of a special report.

Purposes of Collections

The collections by probation officers, as already stated, amounted to \$1,440,483.86. Over one million was collected in non-support cases (\$1,010,480.05), an increase over 1922 of \$144,643.21. Every year shows a gain in this volume, an expanding use of the system in family relief.

The next item in amount is for "suspended fines," collected from persons who are fined by the court and given the time of a probation term to pay. It has been greatly increased in recent years, amounting this year to \$231,633.18, to which should be added \$36,378.33 in costs collected in the same manner. The total of \$268,100.51, goes into the county treasuries. Its significance lies in the fact that the imprisonment for non-payment of fines would amount to 536,000 days or 1,470 years, which at a per capita cost of imprisonment of \$500 a year, lower than the actual cost, would reach \$735,000. Whether or not it represents that saving, it is certain that prison population is greatly depleted by the use of probation with suspension of fines.

Restitution collections amounted to \$161,992, this sum being restored to persons injured by the offender, one condition of whose probation is this payment.

Cost of the Service.

The cost of the probation service is borne by the counties. It amounted this year to \$367,206, an increase of \$21,887 from 1922. The advance is almost wholly in the increase in the salary item. Inequalities in probation salaries have been measurably corrected in recent years and there is a nearer approach to uniformity. The restraint upon expenditure rests chiefly in the economical disposition of the judges, who of all public officials are least open to a charge of extravagance. County commissioners have a check upon salaries of district court probation officers, but not upon those of the Superior Court, nor upon clerical service in any court. Generally speaking, these county officials show a readiness to recognize the value of the probation officers' service although there are continuing instances where the parsimony of such boards operates to restrict employment of the best obtainable persons in this service.

Bureau of Records

Reference is made to the special report as to the use of the Information Bureau maintained by the Commission to supply criminal records. Within the district in which daily reports of all cases in the criminal sessions are made, this service has grown into a requisite to the courts. Their reliance upon it is shown in the constant increase in the inquiries for records which the probation officers make each day as to persons whose cases are then to be disposed of.

The judges of these courts and of the Superior Court are demanding the extension of this gathering of records to the whole State and the legislature will again be asked to provide for it. The administration of justice in the criminal courts misses an essential fact when it is not supplied with complete information as to previous convictions. The confidential exchange of such records is already demonstrated within an area, arbitrarily bounded, to be invaluable..

Conclusion

There is an enthusiasm in their work on the part of the probation officers, a devotion to its humane and its publicly valuable interests, and a fully demonstrated advance by them in the technique of their service which deserves recognition at the hands of the Commission, the board the Commonwealth entrusts with the general promotion of the best methods. It is by their sustained faithfulness and by the confidence shown in them by the courts that probation justifies its place in the State which first employed it, and to-day employs it most extensively and most exactly.

Respectfully submitted,

HERBERT C. PARSONS,

Deputy Commissioner.

PROBATION CONFERENCES

Conference at American House

The annual Fall conference of probation officers of the State was held October 26, 1922 at the American House, Boston. The afternoon session was held at one-thirty with Charles M. Davenport, chairman of the Commission, presiding.

Miss Elizabeth A. Lee, probation officer in the Boston Municipal Court, read a very interesting paper on "The Operation of the Illegitimate Child Law." Hon. Sanford A. Bates, commissioner of correction, took as his subject "The Defective Delinquent Law," and spoke of the new department for defective delinquents which had just been opened at Bridgewater. Dr. Douglas A. Thom, chief of the new division of mental hygiene in the State Department of Mental Diseases, explained the work of his department. There followed a lengthy discussion on various probation topics and complicated probation problems.

Dinner was served at six-thirty, after which there was a short musical program followed by brief addresses by Hon. William C. Wait and Hon. George A. Flynn of the Superior Court, Rev. George A. O'Connor of the Catholic Charitable Bureau, Hon. Arthur P. Stone of the Cambridge District Court, Hon. Charles F. Perkins of the Brookline Court, Dr. George K. Pratt of the Massachusetts Mental Hygiene Society, and Mr. Robert L. Kelso of the Boston Council of Social Agencies.

Conference at Greenfield

In conjunction with the holding of a State Conference of Social Work at Greenfield, the Commission called a conference of probation officers in the counties surrounding Greenfield,—Franklin, Berkshire, Hampden and Hampshire. The meeting was held on Monday, November 13, 1922 in the Parish House of the Second Congregational Church, with Mr. Parsons presiding. The principal topic of discussion was the Illegitimate Child Law and the manner in which its provisions were carried out. There was a very interesting discussion on the matter of confidential records and their use.

Conference at Worcester

A conference of probation officers of Worcester county and those connected with courts whose jurisdiction border on Worcester county was held in the Court House at Worcester on Thursday, January 25, 1923. Mr. Parsons was the presiding officer. He explained to the officers the new standing orders adopted by the Superior Court Committee on Probation. There was discussion of general and individual probation problems.

Conference of Superior Court Officers

A conference of probation officers of the Superior Court throughout the State was held on Saturday, January 27, 1923 at the American House, Boston, with nearly every one of the Superior Court officers present. Luncheon was served at one o'clock, and a very interesting afternoon session was held. Mr. Catheron of the Commission presided. Mr. Parsons gave a resume of probation work in the Superior Court for the past ten years. There was a lengthy discussion of the operation of the orders as to filing of cases and term of probation; lack of clerical assistance; basis for parole; co-operation of lower courts in sending records to Superior Court; general investigation, and compliance with court orders in nonsupport and restitution cases.

Conference at Girls' Industrial School

The Spring conference of probation officers was held on Thursday, May 24, 1923, at the Industrial School for Girls at Lancaster. There was a very large attendance, including members of the various State departments, justices of the courts, members of the Commission, and probation officers.

Miss Driscoll of the Commission presided. After luncheon there were interesting addresses by Mrs. Celia Wellman, probation officer in the Newton court; Miss Elizabeth Tracy, policewoman of Worcester; and Miss Dorothy Dean, Girl Scout Director of Boston.

In the late afternoon a pageant was presented by the girls of the school.

CHANGES IN THE SERVICE

Boston Municipal Court. On November 6, 1922, George A. McDonnell, who had been serving as a pro tem officer, was appointed a permanent probation officer to take the place of Arthur A. Wordell, who was retired on November fourth.

Thomas F. Teehan, probation officer in the Boston Juvenile Court, was appointed in the Boston Municipal Court on January 31, 1923, succeeding William F. Maloney, who was promoted to the Suffolk Superior Court.

Miss Katherine L. Delaney was appointed a pro tem officer in the Boston Municipal Court during the absence of Miss Ethel Wood, who was granted a six months leave of absence on November 1, 1922.

Suffolk Superior Court. Miss Kate M. Reilly was retired from service on May 1, 1923 and Miss Ellen L. Cunniff was appointed to succeed her.

On August 6, 1923 Edward A. Griffin was appointed a probation officer in this court.

Boston Juvenile Court. Edward F. O'Mara was appointed on April 1, 1923 to succeed Thomas F. Teehan.

Roxbury Municipal Court. Mrs. Alice Dillaby Smith resigned as probation officer in this court and was succeeded by Mrs. Mariam Fessenden Boyd on November 1, 1922.

Quincy District Court. Miss Helen H. Gavin was added as a new officer in this court, beginning her services on October 16, 1922.

Natick District Court. On March 30, 1923, this court lost by death the devoted services of Francis C. Perry, the first probation officer of this court.

Norfolk and Plymouth Superior Courts. The death of Albert F. Kirkby, whose active and efficient services were well-known in these counties, occurred on September 27, 1923. Mr. Albert Rounseville was appointed as his successor.

Milford District Court. William G. Pond resigned as probation officer in this court on January 6, 1923 and was succeeded by Charles W. Gould.

BUREAU OF INFORMATION

While the records of all cases in the criminal sessions are, under the present system, supplied from only twenty-one courts, the inquiries come from a wider range and many courts are supplied with information as to persons there

arraigned. The courts whose probation officers report their personal records each day include all those in Suffolk county and those whose jurisdiction adjoins this county.

The number of personal records received during the year ending September 30, 1923, was 86,606, a monthly average of 7,217. The total in 1922 was 74,765 and the monthly average 6,230. The year's addition carries the total of such records in our files to 662,115.

The number of inquiries from courts and others authorized to make them was 31,892, a monthly average of 2,658, and a daily average of 105. This total is nearly double that of the year previous, when the inquiries numbered 16,847, a daily average of 55. The larger use of the Bureau indicates the increasing reliance of the courts upon it. The Bureau is also employed by the Boston Election Commission in search of records of men listed for jury service, the number of names in this inquiry being 12,500 during this year, not included in the total of inquiries stated above.

As the value of this clearing-house of records comes to be more fully realized by the courts, the demand becomes more insistent for the extension of the system to the entire State. Such completion of the Bureau awaits only an appropriation by the legislature as the authority of the Commission is ample under the statutes to put it into effect when financial provision is made.

STATISTICAL TABLES

CASES PLACED ON PROBATION

TABLE 1—*Superior Courts*

Counties.	Under 10 Years		10 to 12 Years		13 Years		14 Years		15 Years		16 Years		Total Juvenile		17 Years		18 Years		19 Years		20 Years		21 to 30 Years		31 to 40 Years		41 to 50 Years		Over 50 Years		Total Adults		Aggregate
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	
Barnstable, Bristol, Dukes County and Nantucket	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	3	-	4	-	4	-	3	1	11	-	10	-	62	4	31	1	9	1	6	1	136	8	148
Berkshire	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	3
Essex	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	52	6	22	-	13	1	1	1	102	9	111
Franklin	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	4	-	2	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	11	-	12
Hampden	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	33	-	6	-	3	-	3	-	3	-	1	-	11	1	4	-	5	1	1	-	28	2	36
Hampshire	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	22	1	4	1	2	1	2	-	-	-	4	-	5	1	4	1	2	1	-	-	19	4	28
Middlesex	2	-	5	-	1	-	4	-	5	-	9	-	26	-	5	-	19	2	18	1	12	1	159	8	76	10	53	-	20	4	362	26	414
Norfolk	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	2	-	3	-	12	-	5	-	5	-	27	4	18	2	15	3	7	1	92	10	104
Plymouth	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	9	3	-	1	4	-	5	-	20	4	24
Suffolk	-	-	2	-	2	-	5	-	9	-	6	1	24	1	24	-	26	2	35	3	31	2	384	48	199	15	96	8	48	9	843	87	955
Worcester	1	-	2	1	2	-	2	-	4	-	3	1	14	2	8	2	16	2	8	-	8	3	102	12	63	9	32	5	24	4	261	37	314
Total	3	-	9	1	8	-	12	-	20	-	29	3	81	4	48	3	85	8	90	4	79	6	815	87	417	39	230	20	113	20	1,877	187	2,149

TABLE II.—Municipal, Juvenile and District Courts

Courts	Under 10 Years		10 to 12 Years		13 Years		14 Years		15 Years		16 Years		Total Juveniles		17 Years		18 Years		19 Years		20 Years		21 to 30 Years		31 to 40 Years		41 to 50 Years		Over 50 Years		Total Adults		Aggregate																														
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F																															
Boston																																																															
Boston, Municipal	45	1	116	20	65	19	88	15	52	21	61	24	427	100	22	14	38	22	75	35	112	39	731	271	1,018	287	679	186	227	41	2,902	895	3,797																														
Boston, Juvenile	2	6	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	16	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12	1	118	5	51	5	47	2	32	1	263	12	291																														
Brighton, Municipal	3	10	1	1	1	1	5	1	10	1	5	4	42	4	9	11	3	20	1	11	2	233	18	220	15	185	10	130	8	819	57	922																															
Charlestown, Municipal	3	19	7	1	9	1	9	1	19	1	20	1	77	1	14	5	2	8	4	4	1	104	3	78	6	38	2	38	2	289	15	382																															
Dorchester, Municipal	9	44	21	1	29	11	11	12	2	126	2	2	126	2	2	3	1	1	1	1	1	267	6	323	11	176	15	108	6	881	38	1,047																															
East Boston, District	9	33	21	1	31	2	24	1	12	1	130	3	22	3	48	5	44	3	57	2	726	59	546	52	353	45	233	19	2,029	188	2,350																																
Roxbury, Municipal	7	66	1	17	20	2	3	1	19	3	132	7	7	1	9	2	15	1	11	2	132	12	166	21	107	13	56	15	503	66	708																																
South Boston, Municipal	6	16	1	13	1	13	1	14	1	11	73	1	7	1	10	1	11	1	13	1	176	1	85	3	62	1	36	1	400	4	477																																
West Roxbury, Municipal	9	37	1	18	2	13	3	10	1	10	1	97	8	12	1	12	1	14	2	21	2	340	13	308	11	196	10	162	1	1,065	40	1,210																															
Chelsea, District																																																															
Total	93	1	347	22	173	21	211	22	143	25	153	34	1,120	125	96	19	137	34	189	41	242	48	2,827	387	2,795	411	1,843	283	1,022	92	9,151	1,315	11,711																														
Over 100,000 Population																																																															
Worcester, Central District	4	1	30	2	12	1	24	1	25	6	19	1	114	11	8	1	11	2	11	1	12	2	155	6	163	8	122	3	67	3	549	25	699																														
Springfield, District	3	27	14	1	25	6	30	2	29	3	128	12	12	16	6	15	3	29	3	20	6	186	59	154	35	102	19	65	5	587	136	863																															
Middlesex, First Eastern District	11	28	22	21	1	25	1	25	1	25	1	132	3	17	1	32	1	31	1	24	1	395	2	265	8	211	10	167	2	1,142	23	1,300																															
Bristol, Third District	7	1	37	1	8	4	18	3	26	5	23	2	119	16	13	3	9	1	9	2	6	1	108	27	119	23	84	10	47	4	395	71	601																														
Middlesex, Third Eastern District	4	26	26	28	3	26	4	31	1	141	8	15	1	12	6	10	2	16	6	187	14	138	10	83	6	48	4	509	49	707																																	
Lowell, District	4	12	4	17	15	3	13	2	14	2	75	11	11	3	14	3	13	4	14	1	139	15	131	16	132	12	94	5	548	59	693																																
Bristol, Second District	1	44	25	38	1	48	5	40	8	196	14	31	1	35	4	18	3	11	1	171	20	143	10	109	20	105	7	623	65	898																																	
Essex, Southern District	3	36	11	20	2	14	18	1	102	3	14	1	102	3	14	1	10	3	12	1	160	18	181	23	108	10	81	8	577	64	746																																
Lawrence, District	6	28	7	7	2	6	1	12	66	3	9	1	6	8	1	6	2	60	11	80	12	49	1	32	3	250	31	350																																			
Total	43	2	268	7	142	5	196	22	213	26	211	19	1,073	81	134	16	145	20	139	18	121	20	1,561	172	1,374	145	1,000	91	706	41	5,180	523	6,857																														
50,000 to 100,000 Population																																																															
Norfolk, East District	7	18	7	9	1	21	2	20	1	82	4	14	2	16	15	18	272	7	194	7	166	11	121	3	816	30	932																																				
Somerville, District	20	58	30	28	34	2	31	2	201	4	6	10	2	14	9	1	135	3	139	6	117	3	66	1	496	16	717																																				
Essex, First District	3	18	1	9	10	2	9	1	6	55	4	9	1	14	15	15	147	17	145	9	100	6	67	2	512	35	606																																				

TABLE II.—Municipal, Juvenile and District Courts.—Continued

Courts	Under 10 Years		10 to 12 Years		13 Years		14 Years		15 Years		16 Years		Total Juveniles		17 Years		18 Years		19 Years		20 Years		21 to 30 Years		31 to 40 Years		41 to 50 Years		Over 50 Years		Total Adults		Aggregate	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F		
50,000 to 100,000 Population—Con.																																		
Brockton, District	7	—	16	—	7	—	9	2	5	2	21	2	65	6	12	—	13	—	9	—	11	—	126	10	112	4	89	4	82	—	454	18	543	
Essex, Northern Central District	3	—	4	—	5	—	3	—	10	—	6	1	31	1	—	—	1	—	1	—	3	—	7	—	15	—	6	—	12	—	45	—	77	
Holyoke, District	1	—	14	—	7	—	3	—	4	2	12	—	41	2	4	1	4	—	6	—	3	—	58	5	68	6	51	2	63	2	257	16	316	
Hampshire, District	1	—	8	1	5	—	1	1	7	2	3	—	25	4	7	2	10	—	7	1	5	—	74	4	89	2	76	4	65	2	333	15	377	
Middlesex, Second Eastern District	—	—	2	—	—	—	1	—	5	—	2	—	10	—	7	—	11	—	18	—	17	1	153	—	110	2	77	—	70	—	463	3	476	
Berkshire, Central District	—	—	3	—	4	—	3	—	5	—	7	—	22	—	8	—	5	—	4	—	3	—	59	4	87	5	45	1	31	3	242	13	277	
Bristol, First District	—	—	2	—	2	—	2	—	3	—	3	—	12	—	3	—	4	—	1	—	—	—	45	3	39	—	41	—	30	—	163	3	178	
Total	42	—	143	2	76	—	69	6	103	11	111	6	544	25	70	6	88	2	90	1	84	2	1,076	53	998	41	768	31	607	13	3,781	149	4,499	
25,000 to 50,000 Population																																		
Middlesex, Fourth Eastern District	1	—	14	—	2	1	5	—	11	1	3	—	36	2	3	—	9	1	6	—	8	—	53	3	80	1	50	3	33	—	242	8	288	
Newton, District	1	—	16	—	7	—	8	—	19	—	32	2	83	2	13	2	28	1	21	2	24	—	163	3	108	6	75	2	61	—	493	16	594	
Fitchburg, District	1	—	7	—	1	—	7	—	10	—	12	2	38	2	12	—	7	1	10	—	16	—	129	1	106	2	57	1	21	1	358	6	404	
Norfolk, Northern District	5	—	7	—	2	—	4	—	2	—	—	—	20	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	1	—	27	3	36	2	14	1	11	—	91	6	117	
Franklin, District	—	—	3	—	2	—	2	—	1	—	4	—	12	—	—	—	6	—	—	—	6	—	14	1	11	1	7	—	16	1	60	3	75	
Worcester, First So. District	—	—	6	—	5	1	1	—	—	—	2	—	14	1	5	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	20	—	19	3	11	—	7	2	63	5	83	
Brookline, Municipal	3	—	23	—	8	—	14	—	6	—	6	1	60	1	5	—	5	2	7	1	9	—	41	2	24	3	18	—	7	—	116	8	185	
Bristol, Fourth District	2	—	4	—	3	—	2	—	4	—	2	—	17	—	1	—	3	—	—	—	2	—	23	—	25	3	12	—	9	—	75	3	95	
Plymouth, Second District	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	1	—	3	—	5	—	6	—	5	—	10	—	50	3	41	—	31	1	21	—	169	4	176	
Chicopee, District	1	—	3	—	4	—	4	—	7	1	3	1	22	2	2	—	4	—	1	—	—	—	15	4	36	2	26	1	9	2	93	9	126	
Worcester, First Northern District	2	—	9	—	4	—	1	1	5	—	2	—	23	1	2	1	—	2	—	2	—	2	—	9	1	16	3	3	—	1	1	35	6	65
Middlesex, First Southern District	—	—	3	—	3	—	6	—	2	—	3	—	17	—	—	—	2	—	3	—	—	—	20	3	25	1	14	1	12	—	76	5	98	
Essex, Eastern District	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	15	—	16	—	17	—	10	—	60	—	61	
Norfolk, Western District	—	—	—	—	3	—	1	—	1	—	1	—	6	—	3	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	11	1	16	2	13	—	3	—	47	3	56	
Middlesex, Central District	—	—	2	—	—	—	5	—	4	—	1	—	12	—	2	—	4	—	4	—	6	—	77	6	67	1	39	—	28	—	227	7	246	
Total	—	—	97	—	44	—	2	61	11	73	2	72	7	363	12	53	3	75	5	61	3	87	—	667	31	626	30	387	10	249	7	2,205	89	2,669

Under 25,000 Population																									
Worcester, Second Southern District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hampden, Western District	3	-	1	-	3	-	5	-	6	-	17	1	2	-	1	-	3	-	7	1	45	2	49	5	23
Berkshire, Northern District	-	3	-	2	-	1	-	1	1	7	1	-	-	1	1	2	-	-	-	16	9	1	14	1	6
Marlborough, District	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	5	-	1	-	1	-	6	-	27	30	1	20	1	25
Worcester, Second Eastern District	-	4	-	9	-	6	-	9	-	6	-	34	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	15	-	24	-	15	-
Newburyport, District	1	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	5	-	3	-	3	-	3	-	3	-	48	1	37	1	33
Plymouth, Third District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	3	-	-	-	-	8	-	26	1	19	-	1
Peabody, District	6	-	4	-	1	-	6	3	6	-	24	3	2	-	8	-	3	-	3	-	30	4	64	3	50
Leominster, District	3	-	16	-	3	-	6	3	2	3	2	34	4	2	-	-	5	-	4	-	29	1	49	2	33
Worcester, Western Dist.	1	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	-	3	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	-	9	-	13	-	6
Worcester, Third So. District	-	-	-	1	-	-	3	-	-	4	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	5	-	5	-	4
Hampden, Eastern District	-	4	-	6	-	8	-	-	2	20	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	10	-	10	-	-
Plymouth, Fourth District	-	5	-	1	-	2	-	-	-	8	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	6	-	13	1	6	-	1
Norfolk, Southern District	1	-	2	-	1	-	1	-	2	9	-	-	-	1	-	-	5	-	30	2	24	2	24	1	18
Middlesex, First Northern District	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	8	1	10	2	2	-	-	3	-	1	-	12	-	27	1	18	
Worcester, First Eastern District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	14	-	7	-	1
Berkshire, Fourth District	8	-	4	-	5	-	4	-	-	22	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	5	2	10	3	21	
Essex, Second District	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	2	-	4	-	-	1	2	-	2	-	-	21	3	23	1	23	2	
Barnstable, First District	1	-	3	-	2	-	1	1	1	9	1	1	-	1	2	-	3	-	11	-	5	1	3	-	2
Barnstable, Second District	-	1	-	2	-	2	-	3	-	11	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Berkshire, Southern District	-	-	1	-	2	-	-	1	-	4	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	4	-	1	-	1
Natick, District	-	3	-	1	-	2	-	1	-	7	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	13	-	7	-	11	-	21
Lee, District	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	7	-	1	-	-	-	-
Hampshire, Eastern District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	1	-	2	-	1	-	7	-	5	-	2	-	-
Franklin, Eastern District	-	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	4	-	2	-	4	-	-
Essex, Third District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	3	-	10	-	19	1	6	-	5
Winchendon, District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	1
Dukes County, District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	1
Williamstown, District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	1
Nantucket, District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	4	-	3	-	2
Total	26	-	55	1	36	1	42	1	36	8	43	6	238	17	24	2	19	3	28	-	41	2	373	15	473
Aggregate	220	3	910	32	471	29	579	52	568	72	590	72	3,338	260	377	46	464	64	507	63	575	72	6,504	658	6,266
																							</		

SUMMARY OF ALL COURTS

Superior	3	9	1	8	12	20	29	3	81	4	48	3	85	8	90	4	79	6	815	87	417	39	230	20	113	20	1,877	187	2,149
Municipal, District and Juvenile	220	3,910	32,471	29,579	52,568	72,590	72,3,338	260	377	46	464	64	507	63	575	72	6,504	658	6,266	652	4,372	425	2,820	155	21,885	2,135	27,618		
Total	223	3,919	33,479	29,591	52,588	72,619	75,3,419	264	425	49	549	72	597	67	654	78	7,319	745	6,683	691	4,602	445	2,933	175	23,762	2,322	29,767		

RESULTS OF PROBATION
TABLE 3.—*Superior Courts*

Counties	Surrendered to the Court for Violation of the Terms of Probation	Disappeared and Defaulted	Probation ended by New Arrest	Case filed or Probationer Discharged
Barnstable, Bristol, Dukes County and Nantucket	2	2	—	201
Berkshire	1	—	—	9
Essex	11	—	—	130
Franklin	2	—	—	11
Hampden	1	—	—	41
Hampshire	1	—	—	18
Middlesex	16	6	—	73
Norfolk	3	5	—	26
Plymouth	7	—	—	43
Suffolk	54	79	13	474
Worcester	39	4	—	290
Total	137	96	13	1,316

TABLE 4.—*Municipal, District and Juvenile Courts*

Courts	Surrendered to the Court for Violation of the Terms of Probation	Disappeared and Defaulted	Probation ended by New Arrest	Case filed or Probationer Discharged
<i>Boston</i>				
Boston, Municipal	350	331	—	2,433
Boston, Juvenile	31	15	—	340
Brighton, Municipal	7	14	1	88
Charlestown, Municipal	52	17	50	703
Dorchester, Municipal	23	11	36	360
East Boston, District	10	9	16	134
Roxbury, Municipal	170	121	29	1,991
South Boston, Municipal	105	5	7	483
West Roxbury, Municipal	17	9	7	157
Chelsea, District	2	3	—	29
Total	767	535	146	6,718
<i>Over 100,000 Population</i>				
Worcester, Central District	153	1	—	573
Springfield, District	85	8	—	627
Middlesex, First Eastern District	16	123	3	1,082
Bristol, Third District	65	—	—	536
Middlesex, Third Eastern District	81	80	—	580
Lowell, District	64	1	—	686
Bristol, Second District	84	—	—	847
Essex, Southern District	169	—	—	585
Lawrence, District	39	2	—	224
Total	756	215	3	5,740

TABLE 4.—Municipal, District and Juvenile Courts—Concluded

Courts	Surrendered to the Court for Violation of the Terms of Probation	Disappeared and Defaulted	Probation ended by New Arrest	Case filed or Probationer Discharged
<i>50,000 to 100,000 Population</i>				
Norfolk, East District	—	116	—	329
Somerville, District	53	118	—	541
Essex, First District	77	—	—	465
Brockton, District	111	5	—	388
Essex, Northern Central District	4	—	—	50
Holyoke, District	25	—	—	183
Hampshire, District	28	—	—	403
Middlesex, Second Eastern District	—	54	—	188
Berkshire, Central District	70	19	—	264
Bristol First District	39	—	—	143
Total	407	312	—	2,954
<i>25,000 to 50,000 Population</i>				
Middlesex, Fourth Eastern District	31	13	—	214
Newton, District	4	30	—	206
Fitchburg, District	50	—	—	278
Norfolk, Northern District	18	11	—	107
Franklin, District	11	—	—	58
Worcester, First Southern District	9	—	—	8
Brookline, Municipal	4	9	—	153
Bristol, Fourth District	6	—	—	62
Plymouth, Second District	12	2	—	87
Chicopee, District	—	—	—	109
Worcester, First Northern District	4	12	—	44
Middlesex, First Southern District	19	2	—	47
Essex, Eastern District	17	—	—	56
Norfolk, Western District	12	1	—	24
Middlesex, Central District	2	3	—	185
Total	199	83	—	1,638
<i>Under 25,000 Population</i>				
Worcester, Second Southern District	—	—	—	—
Hampden, Western District	7	2	—	173
Berkshire, Northern District	1	—	—	64
Marlborough, District	5	—	—	65
Worcester, Second Eastern District	14	2	—	37
Newburyport, District	7	—	—	4
Plymouth, Third District	4	—	—	37
Peabody, District	6	—	—	136
Leominster, District	4	—	—	176
Worcester, Western District	8	1	—	36
Worcester, Third Southern District	3	1	—	32
Hampden, Eastern District	—	—	—	14
Plymouth, Fourth District	3	14	—	43
Middlesex, First Northern District	—	—	—	66
Worcester, First Eastern District	—	—	—	4
Berkshire, Fourth District	3	3	—	60
Essex, Second District	23	—	—	79
Barnstable, First District	1	—	—	29
Barnstable, Second District	—	—	—	3
Berkshire, Southern District	3	—	—	12
Natick, District	1	—	—	26
Lee, District	1	—	—	6
Hampshire, Eastern District	2	—	—	24
Franklin, Eastern District	—	—	—	6
Essex, Third District	—	—	—	52
Winchendon, District	—	—	—	—
Dukes County, District	—	—	—	—
Williamstown, District	—	—	—	—
Nantucket, District	—	—	—	2
Total	96	23	—	1,186
Aggregate	2,325	1,168	149	18,236

TABLE 5.—*Summary of All Courts*

Courts	Total Results Reported	Surrendered to the Court for Violation of the Terms of Probation	Per Cent	Disappeared and Defaulted	Per Cent	Probation ended by New Arrest	Per Cent	Cases Filed or Probationer Discharged	Per Cent
Superior	1,562	137	8.8	96	6.1	13	.8	1,316	84.3
Municipal, district and juvenile	21,878	2,142	9.8	1,168	5.3	332	1.5	18,236	83.4
Total	23,440	2,279	9.7	1,264	5.4	345	1.5	19,552	83.4

PROBATION BY OFFENCES

TABLE 6.—*Offences of Which Persons Placed on Probation were Convicted*

Offences	Juveniles		Adults		Aggregate
	Male	Female	Male	Female	
Abandonment	—	—	4	1	5
Abduction	1	—	5	—	6
Abortion	—	—	5	—	5
Abuse of female child	5	—	8	—	13
Accessory	1	—	4	—	5
Accosting person of opposite sex	1	—	30	—	31
Act, unnatural	5	—	18	2	25
Adultery	—	—	46	24	70
Affray	1	—	14	—	15
Appropriation, unlawful	86	1	176	1	264
Arson	1	—	2	—	3
Assault	7	1	166	14	188
Assault and battery	98	—	944	98	1,140
Assault, indecent	5	—	18	—	23
Assault on officer	—	—	52	5	57
Assault with dangerous weapon	1	—	25	—	26
Assault with intent to kill	—	—	3	—	3
Assault with intent to rape	5	—	4	—	9
Assault with intent to rob	1	—	—	—	2
Attempt to commit crime	—	—	6	—	6
Bigamy	—	—	1	2	3
Breaking and entering	764	6	459	3	1,232
Breaking glass	70	4	63	2	139
Burglar's tools, possessing	—	—	1	—	1
Burglary	4	—	1	—	5
Chastity, offence against	—	—	2	1	3
Cigarettes, selling to minor	—	—	2	—	2
City ordinance and town by-law, violation	115	1	173	9	298
Conspiracy	—	—	9	1	10
Contempt	—	—	3	—	3
Cruelty to animal	1	—	47	—	48
Dangerous weapon, carrying	26	—	138	—	164
Delinquency	101	2	—	—	103
Delinquency, contributing to	—	—	—	1	1
Desertion	—	—	26	1	27
Destitute parent, non-support of	—	—	55	6	61
Disorderly conduct	3	—	42	3	48
Disorderly house, keeping	—	—	9	19	28
Disturbing public assembly	9	—	9	2	20
Disturbing the peace	31	—	312	28	371
Dog, keeping dangerous	—	—	1	—	1
Dog, keeping unlicensed	—	—	28	1	29
Drugs, possessing	—	—	27	9	36
Drunkenness	22	—	11,690	614	12,326
Election law, violation	—	—	4	—	4
Exposure, indecent	3	—	52	—	55
Fare, evading	4	—	15	1	20
Fire alarm, giving false	29	—	8	—	37
Firearm, discharging	2	—	—	—	2
Fire, setting	12	—	1	—	13
Fish and game law, violation of	4	—	34	—	38

PROBATION BY OFFENCES — *Concluded*TABLE 6.—*Offences of Which Persons Placed on Probation were Convicted—Concluded*

Offences	Juvenile		Adults		Aggregate
	Male	Female	Male	Female	
Food law, violation	—	—	13	1	14
Forgery	7	—	22	1	30
Fornication	7	16	111	238	372
Gaming	57	—	177	—	234
Gaming on Lord's Day	34	—	14	—	48
Health regulations, violation of	1	—	17	—	18
House of ill fame, keeping	—	—	6	7	13
Idle and disorderly	—	4	51	45	100
Illegitimate child act, violation	1	—	325	—	326
Incest	—	—	2	—	2
Insurance law, violation of	—	—	1	—	1
Labor law, violation of	—	—	27	—	27
Language, indecent	—	—	1	—	1
Larceny	1,108	94	1,487	430	3,119
Larceny from person	7	—	17	2	26
Lewd and lascivious co-habitation	—	—	126	123	249
Lewdness	23	8	55	49	135
Liquor law, violation of	24	3	1,443	354	1,824
Lodging house law, violation	—	—	2	8	10
Loitering	3	—	12	1	16
Manslaughter	—	—	—	2	2
Mayhem	1	—	1	—	2
Medical law, violation	—	—	4	1	5
Milk law, violation	—	—	16	—	16
Mischief, malicious	78	—	41	2	121
Missile, throwing	11	—	1	—	12
Misuse of transfer	—	—	5	—	5
Motor vehicle law, violation of	55	1	1,967	23	2,046
Motor vehicle, operating to endanger lives	1	—	18	—	19
Motor vehicle, operating under influence of liquor	—	—	262	2	264
Neglect of children	—	—	31	11	42
Neglect of family	—	—	22	—	22
Night-walking	—	1	—	26	27
Non-support	—	—	1,861	26	1,887
Nuisance, keeping	—	—	18	2	20
Oath, false	—	—	1	—	1
Obscene language	—	—	3	—	3
Obscene literature	—	—	12	1	13
Park rule, violation of	2	—	120	2	124
Perjury	—	—	7	1	8
Police officer, assuming to be	—	—	3	—	3
Police officer, resisting	—	—	10	—	10
Polygamy	—	—	3	2	5
Prisoner, rescuing and attempted	—	—	16	—	16
Probation and parole, violation of	1	—	20	—	21
Procuring	—	—	—	2	2
Profanity	—	—	28	5	33
Property, concealing leased	—	—	12	2	14
Property, conveying fraudulently	—	—	10	4	14
Property, injury to	95	—	53	3	151
Property, receiving stolen	16	—	90	13	119
Prostitution	—	—	—	2	2
Railer and brawler	—	—	—	3	3
Railroad law, violation of	22	—	12	—	34
Rape	4	—	19	—	23
Representing self to be attorney	—	—	1	—	1
Ride, stealing	4	—	5	—	9
Robbery	3	—	30	1	34
Runaway	18	19	2	3	42
School law, violation of	—	—	32	9	41
School offender	28	2	3	—	33
Soliciting, immoral	—	—	2	—	2
Stubborn child	128	78	67	44	317
Sunday law, violation of	14	—	33	—	47
Threatening	1	—	53	2	56
Track walking	33	—	17	1	51
Traffic law, violation of	—	—	25	—	25
Trespassing	107	—	49	2	158
Truancy	99	13	—	—	112
True name law, violation of	—	1	11	9	21
Uttering	—	—	5	1	6
Vagabond	—	—	6	—	6
Vagrancy	6	—	83	8	97
Waywardness	2	9	—	—	11
Weights and measures law, violation of	—	—	20	—	20
Total	3,419	264	23,762	2,322	29,767

PROBATION POPULATION

TABLE 7. — *Persons Remaining on Probation Sept. 30, 1923*

Courts	Boys	Girls	Total Juveniles	Men	Women	Total Adults	Aggregate
<i>Superior</i>							
Barnstable, Bristol, Dukes County and Nantucket	3	—	3	178	7	185	188
Berkshire	—	—	—	6	1	7	7
Essex	2	—	2	197	13	210	212
Franklin	2	—	2	4	—	4	6
Hampden	4	—	4	44	2	46	50
Hampshire	8	1	9	10	2	12	21
Middlesex	20	—	20	589	20	609	629
Norfolk	3	—	3	80	7	87	90
Plymouth	1	—	1	75	7	82	83
Suffolk	46	3	49	1,416	128	1,544	1,593
Worcester	14	1	15	214	36	250	265
Total	103	5	108	2,813	223	3,036	3,144
<i>Boston</i>							
Boston, Municipal	—	—	—	1,408	633	2,041	2,041
Boston, Juvenile	239	75	314	—	—	—	314
Brighton, Municipal	26	1	27	104	6	110	137
Charlestown, Municipal	45	5	50	409	48	457	507
Dorchester, Municipal	54	—	54	139	5	144	198
East Boston, District	50	2	52	219	7	226	278
Roxbury, Municipal	111	3	114	845	136	981	1,095
South Boston, Municipal	37	4	41	116	19	135	176
West Roxbury Municipal	31	—	31	65	4	69	100
Chelsea, District	77	5	82	556	46	602	684
Total	670	95	765	3,861	904	4,765	5,530
<i>Over 100,000 Population</i>							
Worcester, Central District	94	12	106	220	17	237	343
Springfield, District	178	17	195	606	193	799	994
Middlesex, First Eastern District	70	5	75	290	8	298	373
Bristol, Third District	94	12	106	232	46	278	384
Middlesex, Third Eastern District	130	6	136	384	20	404	540
Lowell, District	67	17	84	630	56	686	770
Bristol, Second District	86	20	106	293	32	325	431
Essex, Southern District	37	1	38	209	30	239	277
Lawrence, District	64	8	72	221	14	235	307
Total	820	98	918	3,085	416	3,501	4,419
<i>50,000 to 100,000 Population</i>							
Norfolk, East District	63	2	65	491	14	505	570
Somerville, District	72	2	74	128	9	137	211
Essex, First District	38	4	42	223	23	246	288
Brockton, District	52	6	58	194	14	208	266
Essex, Northern Central District	4	—	4	10	—	10	14
Holyoke, District	27	5	32	273	8	281	313
Hampshire, District	20	5	25	90	7	97	122
Middlesex, Second Eastern District	3	1	4	114	1	115	119
Berkshire, Central District	13	—	13	54	4	58	71
Bristol, First District	35	2	37	102	2	104	141
Total	327	27	354	1,679	82	1,761	2,115
<i>25,000 to 50,000 Population</i>							
Middlesex, Fourth Eastern District	11	2	13	146	7	153	166
Newton, District	88	10	98	329	30	359	457
Fitchburg, District	24	2	26	59	5	64	90
Norfolk, Northern District	5	—	5	50	7	57	76
Franklin, District	12	2	14	42	2	44	58
Worcester, First Southern District	10	2	12	44	2	46	58
Brookline, Municipal	32	—	32	96	8	104	136
Bristol, Fourth District	4	—	4	39	2	41	45
Plymouth, Second District	11	—	11	112	2	114	125
Chicopee, District	20	2	22	93	10	103	125
Worcester, First Northern District	10	—	10	21	2	23	33
Middlesex, First Southern District	6	—	6	55	2	57	63
Essex, Eastern District	—	1	1	30	—	30	31
Norfolk, Western District	4	2	6	52	—	52	58
Middlesex, Central District	5	—	5	95	1	96	101
Total	256	23	279	1,263	80	1,343	1,622

PROBATION POPULATION—*Concluded*TABLE 7.—*Persons Remaining on Probation Sept. 30, 1923—Concluded*

Courts	Boys	Girls	Total Juveniles	Men	Women	Total Adults	Aggregate
<i>Under 25,000 Population</i>							
Worcester, Second Southern District	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hampden, Western District	19	2	21	86	11	97	118
Berkshire, Northern District	3	5	8	37	1	38	46
Marlborough, District	3	—	3	63	1	64	67
Worcester, Second Eastern District	32	—	32	93	—	93	125
Newburyport, District	1	—	1	13	—	13	14
Plymouth, Third District	3	—	3	33	2	35	38
Peabody, District	21	—	21	35	6	41	62
Leominster, District	16	3	19	62	2	64	83
Worcester, Western District	8	4	12	15	6	21	33
Worcester, Third Southern District	1	1	2	8	—	8	10
Hampden, Eastern District	9	—	9	20	—	20	29
Plymouth, Fourth District	14	1	15	22	7	29	44
Norfolk, Southern District	10	3	13	19	2	21	34
Middlesex, First Northern District	7	—	7	47	—	47	54
Worcester, First Eastern District	—	1	1	6	—	6	7
Berkshire, Fourth District	3	1	4	8	1	9	13
Essex, Second District	10	—	10	75	8	83	93
Barnstable, First District	9	2	11	15	2	17	28
Barnstable, Second District	9	—	9	6	—	6	15
Berkshire, Southern District	1	—	1	5	—	5	6
Natick, District	1	—	1	14	—	14	15
Lee, District	3	—	3	14	1	15	18
Hampshire, Eastern District	—	—	—	8	—	8	8
Franklin, Eastern District	1	—	1	12	—	12	13
Essex, Third District	5	—	5	14	—	14	19
Winchendon, District	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Dukes County, District	—	1	1	2	—	2	3
Williamstown, District	—	—	—	5	—	5	5
Nantucket, District	—	—	—	8	—	8	8
Total	189	24	213	745	50	795	1,008
Aggregate	2,365	272	2,637	13,446	1,755	15,201	17,838

TABLE 8. — *Disposition of Cases after Conviction*

Courts	Total Dispositions	Probation	Per Cent	Sentenced to Institutions	Per Cent	Fined	Per Cent	Filed	Per Cent
<i>Superior</i>									
Barnstable, Bristol, Dukes County and Nantucket	489	148	30.3	98	20.0	226	46.2	17	3.5
Berkshire	45	3	6.7	8	17.8	2	4.4	32	71.1
Essex	683	111	16.2	78	11.4	301	44.1	193	28.3
Franklin	89	12	13.5	22	24.7	41	46.1	14	15.7
Hampden	339	36	10.6	46	13.6	67	19.8	190	56.0
Hampshire	54	28	51.8	15	27.8	2	3.7	9	16.7
Middlesex	1,843	414	22.5	215	11.7	581	31.5	633	34.3
Norfolk	477	104	21.8	79	16.6	111	23.3	183	38.3
Plymouth	315	24	7.6	61	19.4	62	19.7	168	53.3
Suffolk	5,172	955	18.5	527	10.2	1,067	20.6	2,623	50.7
Worcester	1,803	314	17.4	190	10.5	484	26.9	815	45.2
Total	11,309	2,149	19.0	1,339	11.9	2,944	26.0	4,877	43.1
<i>Boston</i>									
Boston, Municipal	10,630	3,797	35.7	1,101	10.4	—	—	5,732	53.9
Boston, Juvenile	795	527	66.3	—	—	—	—	268	33.7
Brighton, Municipal	1,635	291	17.8	16	1.0	523	32.0	805	49.2
Charlestown, Municipal	3,319	922	27.8	65	2.0	1,118	33.7	1,214	36.5
Dorchester, Municipal	2,282	382	16.7	20	.9	1,153	50.5	727	31.9
East Boston, District	2,444	1,047	42.8	86	3.5	449	18.4	862	35.3
Roxbury, Municipal	6,408	2,350	36.7	170	2.7	1,617	25.2	2,271	35.4
South Boston, Municipal	4,566	708	15.5	1,165	25.5	1,003	22.0	1,690	37.0
West Roxbury, Municipal	2,921	477	16.3	29	1.0	1,431	49.0	984	33.7
Chelsea, District	3,287	1,210	36.8	134	4.1	1,461	44.4	482	14.7
Total	38,287	11,711	30.5	2,876	7.5	8,755	22.8	15,035	39.2
<i>Over 100,000 Population</i>									
Worcester, Central District	3,775	699	18.5	136	3.6	2,310	61.2	630	16.7
Springfield, District	5,240	863	16.5	238	4.5	3,265	62.3	874	16.7
Middlesex, First Eastern District	3,538	1,300	36.8	29	.8	1,954	55.2	255	7.2
Bristol, Third District	2,871	601	20.9	145	5.1	1,413	49.2	712	24.8
Middlesex, Third Eastern District	4,804	707	14.7	1,155	24.0	979	20.4	1,963	40.9
Lowell, District	2,543	693	27.3	209	8.2	1,044	41.0	597	23.5
Bristol, Second District	3,008	898	29.9	560	18.6	989	32.9	561	18.6
Essex, Southern District	3,783	746	19.7	124	3.3	1,264	33.4	1,649	43.6
Lawrence, District	1,574	350	22.2	367	23.3	743	47.2	114	7.3
Total	31,136	6,857	22.0	2,963	9.5	13,961	44.9	7,355	23.6

50,000 to 100,000 Population									
Norfolk, East District	2,485	932	37.5	90	3.6	913	36.8	550	22.1
Somerville, District	2,094	717	34.2	114	5.4	933	44.6	330	15.8
Essex, First District	1,427	606	42.5	166	11.6	394	27.6	261	18.3
Brockton, District	1,830	543	29.7	259	14.1	602	32.9	426	23.3
Essex, Northern Central District	813	77	9.5	64	7.9	471	57.9	201	24.7
Holyoke, District	1,796	316	17.6	134	7.5	1,267	70.5	79	4.4
Hampshire, District	726	377	51.9	47	6.5	263	36.2	39	5.4
Middlesex, Second Eastern District	1,793	476	26.5	60	3.4	700	39.0	557	31.1
Berkshire, Central District	1,042	277	26.6	8	.8	496	47.6	261	25.0
Bristol, First District	712	178	25.0	83	11.7	315	44.2	136	19.1
Total	14,718	4,499	30.5	1,025	6.9	6,354	43.2	2,840	19.3
25,000 to 50,000 Population									
Middlesex, Fourth Eastern District	1,316	288	21.9	53	4.0	623	47.4	352	26.7
Newton, District	1,275	594	46.6	27	2.1	362	28.4	292	22.9
Fitchburg, District	1,183	404	34.2	64	5.4	227	19.2	488	41.2
Norfolk, Northern District	856	117	13.7	33	3.8	499	58.3	207	24.2
Franklin, District	379	75	19.8	30	7.9	199	52.5	75	19.8
Worcester, First Southern District	513	83	16.2	22	4.3	315	61.4	93	18.1
Brookline, Municipal	749	185	24.7	16	2.1	200	26.7	348	46.5
Bristol, Fourth District	658	95	14.4	36	5.5	359	54.6	168	25.5
Plymouth, Second District	737	176	23.8	39	5.3	443	60.2	79	10.7
Chicopee, District	839	126	15.0	41	4.9	448	53.4	224	26.7
Worcester, First Northern District	683	65	9.5	18	2.6	504	73.8	96	14.1
Middlesex, First Southern District	545	98	18.0	26	4.8	192	35.2	229	42.0
Essex, Eastern District	380	60	15.8	15	4.0	203	53.3	102	26.9
Norfolk, Western District	532	56	10.5	13	2.4	276	51.9	187	35.2
Middlesex, Central District	390	246	63.1	6	1.5	91	23.3	47	12.1
Total	11,035	2,668	24.2	439	3.9	4,941	44.8	2,987	27.1
Under 25,000 Population									
Worcester, Second Southern District	31	-	-	18	58.1	7	22.6	6	19.3
Hampden, Western District	733	173	23.6	29	4.0	390	53.2	141	19.2
Berkshire, Northern District	470	58	12.3	33	7.0	319	67.9	60	12.8
Marlborough, District	327	119	36.4	9	2.7	131	40.1	68	20.8
Worcester, Second Eastern District	401	114	28.4	16	4.0	250	62.4	21	5.2
Newburyport, District	383	164	42.8	10	2.6	169	44.1	40	10.5
Plymouth, Third District	58	57	98.3	1	1.7	-	-	-	-
Peabody, District	843	222	26.3	56	6.7	221	26.2	344	40.8
Leominster, District	433	190	43.9	20	4.6	96	22.2	127	29.3
Worcester, Western District	187	43	23.0	14	7.5	111	59.3	19	10.2
Worcester, Third Southern District	161	24	14.9	7	4.4	62	38.5	68	42.2
Hampden, Eastern District	224	43	19.2	29	12.9	143	63.9	9	4.0
Plymouth, Fourth District	292	37	12.7	19	6.5	185	63.3	51	17.5
Norfolk, Southern District	120	116	96.6	2	1.7	-	-	2	1.7
Middlesex, First Northern District	325	92	28.3	13	4.0	85	26.2	135	41.5
Worcester, First Eastern District	92	27	29.4	7	7.6	52	56.5	6	6.5
Berkshire, Fourth District	280	74	26.5	11	3.9	142	50.7	53	18.9

COMPARATIVE DISPOSITIONS — *Concluded*
TABLE 8 — *Disposition of Cases after Conviction — Concluded*

Courts	Total Dispositions	Probation	Per Cent	Sentenced to Institutions	Per Cent	Fined	Per Cent	Filed	Per Cent
<i>Under 25,000 Population — Con.</i>									
Essex, Second District	543	91	16.7	22	4.1	236	43.5	194	35.7
Barnstable, First District	188	39	20.7	28	14.9	56	29.8	65	34.6
Barnstable, Second District	129	11	8.5	12	9.3	67	51.9	39	30.3
Berkshire, Southern District	183	14	7.7	7	3.8	131	71.6	31	16.9
Natick, District	235	61	26.0	24	10.2	83	35.3	67	28.5
Lee, District	159	12	7.5	16	10.1	111	69.8	20	12.6
Hampshire, Eastern District	109	20	18.3	6	5.5	77	70.7	6	5.5
Franklin, Eastern District	70	15	21.4	9	12.9	34	48.6	12	17.1
Essex, Third District	235	44	18.7	18	7.7	137	58.3	36	15.3
Winchendon, District	125	43	34.4	1	.8	48	38.4	33	26.4
Dukes County, District	6	5	83.3	1	16.7	—	—	—	—
Williamstown, District	2	2	100.0	—	—	—	—	—	—
Nantucket, District	12	11	91.7	—	—	1	8.3	—	—
Total	7,356	1,921	26.1	438	5.9	3,344	45.5	1,653	22.5
Aggregate	113,841	29,805	26.2	8,990	7.9	40,299	35.4	34,747	30.5

RELEASES BY PROBATION OFFICERS

TABLE 9 — *Persons Released without Court Action (Drunkenness) and from Jails*

Courts	Persons Arrested for Drunkenness			Prisoners
	Arrests	Releases	Per Cent	Releases
<i>Superior</i>				
Barnstable, Bristol, Dukes County and Nantucket	—	—	—	4
Berkshire	—	—	—	2
Essex	—	—	—	12
Franklin	—	—	—	2
Hampden	—	—	—	8
Hampshire	—	—	—	5
Middlesex	—	—	—	25
Norfolk	—	—	—	6
Plymouth	—	—	—	13
Suffolk	—	—	—	109
Worcester	—	—	—	68
Total	—	—	—	254
<i>Boston</i>				
Boston, Municipal	17,875	11,182	62.55	18
Boston, Juvenile	—	—	—	—
Brighton, Municipal	1,055	536	50.80	—
Charlestown, Municipal	2,974	583	19.60	3
Dorchester, Municipal	832	373	44.83	—
East Boston, District	3,096	1,919	61.98	—
Roxbury, Municipal	5,882	2,301	39.11	5
South Boston, Municipal	5,447	3,472	63.74	—
West Roxbury, Municipal	1,479	445	30.08	—
Chelsea, District	2,341	470	20.07	—
Total	40,981	21,281	51.92	26
<i>Over 100,000 Population</i>				
Worcester, Central District	4,415	2,520	57.07	3
Springfield, District	1,970	534	27.10	13
Middlesex, First Eastern District	1,453	196	13.48	—
Bristol, Third District	1,319	530	37.13	20
Middlesex, Third Eastern District	3,166	1,797	62.50	—
Lowell, District	2,282	1,339	58.67	44
Bristol, Second District	2,184	1,130	51.73	17
Essex, Southern District	2,104	737	35.02	1
Lawrence, District	2,810	2,000	78.29	30
Total	21,703	10,783	49.68	128
<i>50,000 to 100,000 Population</i>				
Norfolk, East District	1,166	174	14.92	—
Somerville, District	1,491	15	1.00	8
Essex, First District	1,342	873	65.05	83
Brockton, District	1,383	595	43.02	36
Essex, Northern Central District	861	414	48.08	3
Holyoke, District	1,071	3	.28	6
Hampshire, District	527	55	10.43	5
Middlesex, Second Eastern District	979	154	15.73	—
Berkshire, Central District	630	187	29.68	4
Bristol, First District	539	241	44.71	1
Total	9,989	2,711	27.13	146
<i>25,000 to 50,000 Population</i>				
Middlesex, Fourth Eastern District	685	137	20.00	14
Newton, District	609	35	5.74	—
Fitchburg, District	1,046	234	22.37	9
Norfolk, Northern District	506	198	39.13	3
Franklin, District	147	56	38.09	2
Worcester, First Southern District	225	111	49.33	2
Brookline, Municipal	326	5	1.53	—
Bristol, Fourth District	273	66	24.17	1
Plymouth, Second District	493	7	1.42	2
Chicopee, District	451	6	1.33	6
Worcester, First Northern District	403	—	—	—
Middlesex, First Southern District	259	43	16.60	5
Essex, Eastern District	413	197	47.69	3
Norfolk, Western District	169	1	.59	1
Middlesex, Central District	234	—	—	2
Total	6,239	1,096	17.56	50

RELEASES BY PROBATION OFFICERS—*Concluded*TABLE 9.—*Persons Released without Court Action (Drunkenness) and from Jails—Concluded*

Courts	Persons Arrested for Drunkenness			Prisoners
	Arrests	Releases	Per Cent	Releases
<i>Under 25,000 Population</i>				
Worcester, Second Southern District	163	—	—	—
Hampden, Western District	352	15	4.26	5
Berkshire, Northern District	424	255	60.14	2
Marlborough, District	177	5	2.82	3
Worcester, Second Eastern District	192	11	5.75	3
Newburyport, District	187	4	2.14	—
Plymouth, Third District	115	62	63.91	1
Peabody, District	347	6	1.73	3
Leominster, District	229	—	—	2
Worcester, Western District	61	1	1.64	—
Worcester, Third Southern District	82	37	45.12	—
Hampden, Eastern District	56	—	—	2
Plymouth, Fourth District	127	16	12.59	6
Norfolk, Southern District	136	—	—	—
Middlesex, First Northern District	80	12	15.00	2
Worcester, First Eastern District	403	—	—	—
Berkshire, Fourth District	158	70	44.30	—
Essex, Second District	218	38	17.43	7
Barnstable, First District	38	3	7.88	1
Barnstable, Second District	—	—	—	—
Berkshire, Southern District	48	2	4.16	—
Natick, District	142	3	2.11	3
Lee, District	20	—	—	—
Hampshire, Eastern District	41	9	21.95	2
Franklin, Eastern District	19	1	5.26	—
Essex, Third District	106	—	—	1
Winchendon, District	3	—	—	—
Dukes County, District	2	1	50.00	—
Williamstown, District	4	—	—	—
Nantucket, District	3	—	—	—
Total	3,933	551	14.00	43
Aggregate	82,845	36,422	43.96	647

COLLECTIONS BY PROBATION OFFICERS

TABLE 10 — Collections of Moneys Under Orders of the Court

Courts	Restitution	Non-support	Court Expense	Suspended Sentences	Total
<i>Superior</i>					
Barnstable, Bristol, Dukes County and Nantucket	\$1,630 94	\$16,011 45	\$371 00	—	\$18,013 39
Berkshire	404 00	2,635 00	—	—	3,039 00
Essex	9,005 77	29,729 00	1,306 75	—	40,041 52
Franklin	55 00	—	18 00	—	73 00
Hampden	4,073 00	1,573 00	—	—	5,646 00
Hampshire	97 00	1,246 00	—	—	1,343 00
Middlesex	9,884 95	55,284 42	6,795 81	—	71,965 18
Norfolk	1,442 06	4,881 22	15 00	—	6,338 28
Plymouth	767 20	8,564 33	60 28	—	9,391 81
Suffolk	45,136 79	122,727 97	2,152 76	—	170,017 52
Worcester	5,699 80	12,436 16	624 15	—	18,760 11
Total	\$78,196 51	\$255,088 55	\$11,343 75	—	\$344,628 81
<i>Boston</i>					
Boston, Municipal	\$23,006 56	\$95,002 69	\$7,516 99	\$16,159 95	\$141,686 19
Boston, Juvenile	961 24	—	271 30	—	1,232 54
Brighton, Municipal	846 82	20,456 62	2 63	3,438 14	24,744 21
Charlestown, Municipal	1,562 12	14,213 24	—	4,169 50	19,944 86
Dorchester, Municipal	756 99	14,566 00	—	4,109 00	19,431 99
East Boston, District	1,265 73	12,440 50	—	11,781 00	25,487 23
Roxbury, Municipal	3,653 11	59,878 95	—	13,723 30	77,255 36
South Boston, Municipal	833 41	8,670 75	8,047 50	—	17,551 66
West Roxbury, Municipal	341 69	2,918 50	—	4,450 00	7,717 19
Chelsea, District	1,517 26	8,291 57	1,035 92	4,643 00	15,487 75
Total	\$34,744 93	\$236,438 82	\$16,874 34	\$62,473 89	\$350,531 98
<i>Over 100,000 Population</i>					
Worcester, Central District	\$875 24	\$27,035 29	—	\$3,957 50	\$31,868 03
Springfield, District	4,338 49	36,776 78	\$76 21	12,624 78	53,816 26
Middlesex, First Eastern District	2,400 17	20,870 50	—	15,111 50	38,382 17
Bristol, Third District	1,771 29	44,399 25	356 78	6,731 90	53,259 22
Middlesex, Third Eastern District	5,745 86	39,130 64	617 48	6,090 00	51,583 98
Lowell, District	1,651 65	28,368 29	183 41	2,640 50	32,843 85
Bristol, Second District	1,997 27	25,222 73	114 80	12,348 20	39,683 00
Essex, Southern District	4,340 98	52,718 01	2,094 83	18,778 37	77,932 19
Lawrence, District	2,695 14	25,171 70	—	475 00	28,341 84
Total	\$25,816 09	\$299,693 19	\$3,443 51	\$78,757 75	\$407,710 54
<i>50,000 to 100,000 Population</i>					
Norfolk East District	\$716 64	\$12,694 88	\$24 01	\$7,696 71	\$21,132 24
Somerville, District	968 25	21,709 45	38 00	3,719 00	26,434 70
Essex, First District	3,933 22	31,103 92	1,133 10	8,802 26	44,972 50
Brockton, District	2,047 88	18,765 65	—	4,898 25	25,711 78
Essex, Northern Central District	344 75	6,415 00	—	287 00	7,046 75
Holyoke District	365 69	6,248 00	—	1,759 20	8,372 89
Hampshire, District	485 49	6,839 14	—	8,964 01	16,288 64
Middlesex, Second Eastern District	180 36	1,522 95	—	1,346 25	3,049 56
Berkshire, Central District	2,598 84	11,599 35	—	3,033 90	17,232 09
Bristol, First District	88 00	3,649 00	515 00	—	4,252 00
Total	\$11,729 12	\$120,547 34	\$1,710 11	\$40,506 58	\$174,493 15
<i>25,000 to 50,000 Population</i>					
Middlesex, Fourth Eastern District	\$827 43	\$7,488 75	—	\$3,896 50	\$12,212 68
Newton, District	1,065 38	11,613 00	—	5,443 50	18,121 88
Fitchburg, District	428 86	3,973 63	\$10 00	3,945 00	8,357 49
Norfolk, Northern District	492 00	5,551 00	—	1,410 00	7,453 00
Franklin, District	7 20	1,332 00	—	1,565 00	2,904 20
Worcester, First Southern District	45 00	1,307 12	100 00	—	1,452 12
Brookline, Municipal	3,217 42	7,068 01	1,745 05	—	12,030 48
Bristol, Fourth District	160 00	4,906 16	—	1,684 00	6,750 16
Plymouth, Second District	55 00	1,935 00	57 50	4,279 00	6,326 50
Chicopee, District	479 35	4,208 50	—	325 00	5,012 85
Worcester, First Northern District	—	724 87	7 18	412 00	1,144 05

COLLECTIONS BY PROBATION OFFICERS—*Concluded*TABLE 10—*Collections of Moneys Under Orders of the Court—Concluded*

Courts	Restitution	Non-support	Court Expense	Suspended Sentences	Total
<i>25,000 to 50,000 Population—Con.</i>					
Middlesex, First Southern District	\$441 80	\$4,560 65	\$450 00	—	\$5,452 45
Essex, Eastern District	17 00	6,766 90	—	\$1,030 00	7,813 90
Norfolk, Western District	10 00	2,550 30	—	—	2,560 30
Middlesex, Central District	145 59	1,525 58	176 40	4,123 90	5,971 47
Total	\$7,392 03	\$65,511 47	\$2,546 13	\$28,113 90	\$103,563 53
<i>Under 25,000 Population</i>					
Worcester, Second Southern District	—	—	—	—	—
Hampden, Western District	—	\$1,684 50	—	\$4,290 58	\$5,975 08
Berkshire, Northern District	\$104 00	2,430 00	—	—	2,534 00
Marlborough, District	361 04	1,517 50	—	432 00	2,310 54
Worcester, Second Eastern District	54 50	232 00	\$4 00	—	290 50
Newburyport, District	298 00	1,132 50	—	2,062 00	3,492 50
Plymouth, Third District	315 23	987 00	—	1,751 98	3,054 21
Peabody, District	603 89	4,823 00	—	1,464 00	6,890 89
Leominster, District	233 98	3,287 37	263 73	1,483 00	5,268 08
Worcester, Western District	25 00	1,055 50	—	304 50	1,385 00
Worcester, Third Southern District	517 15	1,532 99	—	—	2,050 14
Hampden, Eastern District	9 00	949 50	—	150 00	1,108 50
Plymouth, Fourth District	219 75	493 00	25 00	1,480 00	2,217 75
Norfolk, Southern District	168 70	934 00	—	1,346 00	2,448 70
Middlesex, First Northern District	—	335 00	—	750 00	1,085 00
Worcester, First Eastern Dist.	—	155 00	—	404 18	559 18
Berkshire, Fourth District	66 25	145 00	—	—	211 25
Essex, Second District	138 00	1,297 00	—	3,387 00	4,822 00
Barnstable, First District	—	2,032 00	—	218 00	2,250 00
Barnstable, Second District	55 00	1,105 00	—	—	1,160 00
Berkshire, Southern District	120 50	1,270 49	167 76	—	1,558 75
Natick, District	134 33	1,180 50	—	—	1,314 83
Lee, District	61 00	474 20	—	1,060 00	1,595 20
Hampshire, Eastern District	390 00	592 93	—	—	982 93
Franklin, Eastern District	—	951 00	—	—	951 00
Essex, Third District	30 00	1,339 00	—	605 00	1,974 00
Winchendon, District	28 00	1,095 00	—	520 25	1,643 25
Dukes County, District	—	—	—	72 57	72 57
Williamstown, District	—	—	—	—	—
Nantucket, District	180 00	170 00	—	—	350 00
Total	\$4,113 32	\$33,200 98	\$460 49	\$21,781 06	\$59,555 85
Aggregate	\$161,992 00	\$1,010,480 35	\$36,378 33	\$231,633 18	\$1,440,483 86